

REMARKS

By this Amendment the specification has been amended on page 3 to replace the reference to claim 1 with the relevant disclosure from claim 1 and on pages 6 and 7 to refer to new Fig. 5 (see accompanying Letter Re Drawings), and claim 7 has been amended to overcome the examiner's stated objection. Entry is requested.

In the outstanding final Office Action the examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bastholm et al. in view of Weimer et al.

The inventor again asserts that this rejection is improper.

The object of the present invention is to reduce the acoustic noise level of linear actuators especially within furniture. By the invention it has unexpectedly been found out that the general level of acoustic noise can be reduced significantly by electrical means.

According to the invention, a first control compensates for the loss in the motor and a second control is adapted to remove variations in the voltage, thereby keeping the speed of the motor constant for a long period of time as well as for a short period of time. There is no adjustment of the input voltage, which is the voltage of the public power network.

Weimer et al. deal with the specific problems relating to electrical power supply in aircraft. More specifically, Weimer et al. deal with a feed-forward control of aircraft bus DC boost convert. Weimer et al. control the input voltage as their problem is that the terminal voltage of an energy capacitor used in aircraft varies. In the Abstract, line 10 it is stated that "(T)he open loop control arrangement senses input voltage rather than output voltage of the coupling circuit in what is termed a 'feed forward' output regulation algorithm." When Weimer et al. refer to "feed forward" in quotation marks, this is due to the fact that it is not an actual feed forward control. Further, Weimer et al. state in column 12, line 25, that the output voltage of the converter could be regulated against variations in the input voltage. However, Weimer et al. do deal with the problem of variations in the load. The Weimer et al. solution could not be used to solve the problem underlying the present invention; namely, keeping a motor running at a constant speed as the Weimer et al. solution would result in variations in the motor speed. In fact, Weimer et al. deal with a quite different problem; namely, the problem of transients, however that is not an issue in the present invention.

Further, the examiner states on page 4, line 16, that Weimer et al. disclose a converter that uses forward step where the duty cycle is expressed in terms of a constant and the input voltage, where Vref is the constant and V1 is the input voltage. However, it is quite obvious from

Fig. 4 that Vref varies with variations in the input voltage V1. In Fig. 3 is also indicated a decreasing Vref.

Accordingly, there is NO suggestion for combining Weimer et al. with Bastholm et al. to obtain the objective in the present application.
Favorable reconsideration of claims 1-7 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC

By:



Richard H. Tushin
Registration No. 27,297
Franklin Square, Third Floor West
1300 I Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3353
(202) 906-8680